

REMARKS**Claim Objections**

Claims 14-15 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 1.75 as being substantial duplicates of Claims 10-11. Applicant respectfully traverses this objection.

Claims 10 and 11 refer to certain voltages being applied to the n-well and the p-well. Claims 14 and 15 refer to certain voltages being applied to a lower well and an isolation well. These are not necessarily stating the same thing. Claims 14 and 15 are substantially broader in scope than claims 10 and 11 since, as stated at paragraph 21 of the present specification, neither well is required to be a predetermined conductivity type.

Claim Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 112

Claims 16-17 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph, as being incomplete for omitting essential structural cooperative relationships of elements, such omission amounting to a gap between the necessary structural connections. Claims 14 – 17 have been amended to correct the typographical error and overcome the rejection under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph. Claims 14 – 17 mistakenly depended from claim 9 instead of correctly depending from claim 13. This has been corrected.

Claim Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 102

Claims 1-5 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by *Chien* (U.S. Patent No. 6,137,730). Claims 1-9, 12, 13, and 22 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by *Ooishi et al.* (U.S. Patent No. 6,714,451). Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection.

The Examiner alleges that Figure 3 of *Ooishi et al.* shows Applicant's invention as claimed in claims 9 and 13. Figure 3 shows and column 4, lines 64 – 67 describe a memory device that consists of a control gate 4, floating gates 3, and bit lines BL. There is no teaching or suggestion in *Ooishi et al.* that an isolation well is formed in a lower well and that each memory block is formed in a different isolation well as claimed in Applicant's claim 13. Similarly, *Ooishi et al.* neither teaches nor suggests that a p-well is formed in an n-well and that each memory block is formed in a different p-well as claimed in Applicant's claim 9.

Allowable Subject Matter

Claims 10-11 were objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form, including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

Claims 18-21 were allowed.

CONCLUSION

For the above-cited reasons, Applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner allow the claims of the present application. If the Examiner has any questions or concerns regarding this application, please contact the undersigned at (612) 312-2211. No new matter has been added and no additional fee is required by this amendment and response.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: _____

4/18/05

Kenneth W. Bolvin

Kenneth W. Bolvin

Reg. No. 34,125

Attorneys for Applicant
Leffert Jay & Polglaze
P.O. Box 581009
Minneapolis, MN 55458-1009
T 612 312-2200
F 612 312-2250